



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/727,594 | 12/05/2003 | Pierre Delbreil | Q78566 | 7498 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 08/31/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | LEE, JOHN J | |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. | | | | |
| SUITE 800 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | 2618 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/31/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/727,594 | DELBREIL ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | JOHN J. LEE | 2618 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments received on 8/15/2007 have been carefully considered but they are not persuasive because the teaching of the cited references as set forth in the previous final rejection reads on all the claims.

During the examination, the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation.

In this case, in the main arguement, The Applicant argues that the Umeda et al. (US 2002/0150228) and Eidson (US 6,411,824) do not teach the claimed limitation "electromagnetic field measurements of an envirnment of the antenna at the fixed transmitting station".

However, The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the teaching of Umeda and Eidson do not teach the claimed invention. Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the Examiner is of the opinion that Umeda teaches the mobile communication system, base station or any network system, detects a change in an envirnment (the change in electromagnetic wave envirnment, see pages 5, paragraphs 47) in use concerning an object, and determining that changes in the electromagnetic wave envirnment should be detected in the communication terminal (Fixed wireless terminal or mobile terminal) according to cell determination or transmission quality monitoring such that measurements (Fig. 3 and pages 5, paragraphs 47 – pages 6, paragraphs 53), regarding the claimed limitation. More specifically, the claimed limitation "electromagnetic field measurements" is not require or limit for special interpretation or indicating any particular function. Furthermore, Eidson also teaches an antenna connected to base station (fixed repeater, communication terminal) and the antenna being performed measuring the electromagnetic field envirnment (see Fig. 1 and column 7 lines 16 – 48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Umeda as taught by Eidson, provide the motivation to improve signal transmission and reception reliability and adaptability in wireless communication system.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Umeda reference teaches the base station with antenna communicates and controls with mobile terminals or communication terminal in the wireless communication system, and Eidson teaches antennas in base station transmits and receives the communication signal for optimal adaptation in wireless communication system. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Umeda as taught by Eidson, provide the motivation to improve signal transmission and reception reliability and adaptability in wireless communication system.

Continuation of 13. Other:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-7880.



EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600